

Date: Sun, 25 Jul 93 14:46:50 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #256
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 25 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 256

Today's Topics:

1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.

Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer

Code/NoCode

Give a VE \$5.60, walk

Guide to the Personal Radio Newsgroups

Order pizza on your autopatch now

STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 25 Jul 93 15:53:34 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: Re:
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much
>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in
>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.

Not to actually defend the League (gosh, I wouldn't want people to get the wrong idea...) but the League's original proposal in 1989 to the FCC for the codeless license did not grant 2mtr privs to codeless techs, other than the "data" portion for packet radio use.

Personally, I would have much rather saw the Codeless Tech license granted the same privs above 30mhz that Novices are -- with perhaps an additional band or two to "save that bandwidth".

MD

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 93 17:10:48 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The FCC has access to the computer 1 (one) day a week.

I saw that about 30-40 posts ago.

--

Randy,KA1UNW If you get a shock while servicing your equipment
DON'T JUMP! You might break an expensive tube.

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 19:25:25 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!src.honeywell.com!
thumper!linde@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code/NoCode
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul22.144236.25076@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodo@dgcr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

>In article <CAKJp8.6CK@egr.uri.edu>, swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

>|>...
>|> operators (I know some). Maybe the FCC should allow a no-code license for one year,

>|> after that the code must be taken...I don't know, just a thought...

>|>

>|> 73s de KB1AMB/AA

>|> 73s

>--

>Interesting idea - shorter duration no-code licenses... that would be an excellent incentive for upgrading. No-coders would have to retest annually or upgrade to stay on the air. You would have to assign calls from a different block each year (in rotation) to prevent people from simply continuing to use the same call illegally but it is doable. Calls could be >3x4 with the first character of the last group of four denoting the year;

>
> NIY2ARTY Valid for 1994
> NIY2BRTY Valid for 1995...
>
>When retesting for no-code the applicant would be assigned a completely
>different call rather than simply incrementing the letter. This would
>reduce the chances of someone simply using the incremented call without
>re-testing. The longer call would also be an incentive to upgrade. The
>number of times an individual could re-test at nocode could be limited to
>two (for those who test late in the year, etc....).
>

Well if you think retesting is good. I think it should be applied across the board. Everyone gets retested when they renew. I also think that the no-coders are getting hacked. I would love to see a more complex technical test including some programming and digital theory to allow the use of any automation or digital packet technology. I would hazard a guess that >60% of the OF extra's would have problems. Then the OF's that keep on bringing up this dead dead issue could just stick to 20m and amuse themselves. Everyone knows they are so well behaved there now :-) I mean just listen in anytime. Try it during contests and you get a wonderful feeling on what code does to ones mind.

If you want to test for required skills and not just use it as some hazing ritual we should have digital theory, MMW design (most of our BW is up there you know), computer programming (I know of very few current radios that do not make use of some form of computer control.), and many other areas.

Arrg, Where do you come from with this code/no-code stuff. I though this was finally resolved when the FCC forced the no-code license in over the ARRL and their stupid limitations. (no 2m etc..) If things keep on going the way they look. I would bet that code testing will be eliminated from most if not all classes within 10 years. Maybe then we can go on to some 10ghz+ pcs work and highspeed digital.

Larry Linde N0PCE

Date: 25 Jul 1993 15:18 CDT
From: cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jane.uh.edu!st2cm@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul24.220849.8972@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes...

[stuff deleted]

>If you don't care, then shut up. The rest of us are tired of hearing you
>whine about something you don't even care about. Do you just like seeing
>your name in the news postings? Crawl back into your hole and pull your
>radio in over you.

>
>73,
>Todd
>N9MWB

I think some of us have often thought the same about you, Todd.
Now, don't get me wrong, I *am* in support of a no-code (aka "no-clue")
ticket...just not in its current form. I believe one of the supporting
arguements was to encourage the utilization of bands we are in grave
danger of losing (i.e. 222, 420, 902, and so on). Well, that sounds all
nice and fine in theory, but not in fact. Here in Houston, virtually all
of these new hams have headed straight for Two Meters.

I think MD commented that the League had suggested a Codeless Technician
license which would allow operation on all amateur bands 222 MHz and above.
Quite correct, and as the primary organization representing the interests
of radio amateurs in the United States, I am very surprised (stunned even)
that this proposal didn't pass the FCC in favor of the more liberal one.
Something just doesn't quite add up here.

Now that the League has access to the Internet, and this newsgroup, perhaps
they will be kind enough to post a reply to this.

--Robert

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 16:48:10 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!crash!newshub.nosc.mil!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.unomaha.edu!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Guide to the Personal Radio Newsgroups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Posted-By: auto-faq 2.4
Archive-name: radio/personal-intro
Revision: 1.4 06/30/93 12:04:14
Changes: new rec.radio.amateur.* newsgroups, cs.utexas.edu gateway

(Note: The following is reprinted with the permission of the author.
Due to the recent reorganization, it is also on a temporarily-
accelerated posting schedule as follows:

July weekly

August bi-weekly
September back to monthly)

This message describes the `rec.radio.amateur.*`, `rec.radio.cb`, `rec.radio.info`, and `rec.radio.swap` newsgroups. It is intended to serve as a guide for the new reader on what to find where. Questions and comments may be directed to the author, Jay Maynard, K5ZC, by Internet electronic mail at `jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu`. This message was last changed on 30 June 1993 to add the groups created during the latest reorganization vote and the description of the `cs.utexas.edu` gateway.

History

=====

Way back when, before there was a Usenet, the Internet hosted a mailing list for hams, called (appropriately enough) `INFO-HAMS`. Ham radio discussions were held on the mailing list, and sent to the mailboxes of those who had signed up for it. When the Usenet software was created, and net news as we now know it was developed, a newsgroup was created for hams: `net.ham-radio`. The mailing list and the newsgroup were gatewayed together, eventually.

As the net grew, and as packet radio came into vogue, packet discussion began to dominate other topics in the group and on the list. This resulted in the logical solution: a group was created to hold the packet discussion, and another corresponding mailing list was created as well: `net.ham-radio.packet` and `PACKET-RADIO`, respectively.

These two groups served for several years, and went through Usenet's Great Renaming essentially unchanged, moving from `net.ham-radio[.packet]` to `rec.ham-radio[.packet]`. Readership and volume grew with the rest of the network.

The `INFO-HAMS` mailing list was originally run from a US Army computer at White Sands Missile Range, `SIMTEL20`. There were few problems with this arrangement, but one was that the system was not supposed to be used for commercial purposes. Since one of hams' favorite pastimes is swapping gear, it was natural for hams to post messages about equipment for sale to `INFO-HAMS/rec.ham-radio`. This ran afoul of `SIMTEL20`'s no-commercial-use restriction, and after some argument, a group was created specifically for messages like that: `rec.ham-radio.swap`. This group wasn't gatewayed to a mailing list, thus avoiding problems.

While all this was happening, other folks wanted to discuss other aspects of the world of radio than the personal communications services. Those folks created the `rec.radio.shortwave` and `rec.radio.noncomm` newsgroups, and established the precedent of the `rec.radio.*` hierarchy, which in turn reflected Usenet's overall trend toward a hierarchical name structure.

The debate between proponents of a no-code ham radio license and its opponents grew fierce and voluminous in late 1989 and 1990. Eventually, both sides grew weary of the debate, and those who had not been involved even more so. A proposal for a newsgroup dedicated to licensing issues failed. A later proposal was made for a group that would cover the many recurring legal issues discussions. During discussion of the latter proposal, it became clear that it would be desirable to fit the ham radio groups under the rec.radio.* hierarchy. A full-blown reorganization was passed by Usenet voters in January 1991, leading to the overall structure we now use.

After the reorganization, more and more regular information postings began to appear, and were spread out across the various groups in rec.radio.*. Taking the successful example of the news.answers group, where informational postings from across the net are sent, the group rec.radio.info was created in December, 1992, with Mark Salyzyn, VE6MGS, initially serving as moderator.

In January, 1993, many users started complaining about the volume in rec.radio.amateur.misc. This led to a discussion about a second reorganization, which sparked the creation of a mailing list by Ian Kluft, KD6EUI. This list, which was eventually joined by many of the most prolific posters to the ham radio groups, came up with a proposal to add 11 groups to the rec.radio.amateur hierarchy in April 1993. The subsequent vote, held in May and early June, approved the creation of five groups: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc (to replace .packet), .equipment, .homebrew, .antenna, and .space.

The Current Groups

I can hear you asking, "OK, so this is all neat history, but what does it have to do with me now?" The answer is that the history of each group has a direct bearing on what the group is used for, and what's considered appropriate where.

The easy one is rec.radio.amateur.misc. It is what rec.ham-radio was renamed to during the reorganization. Any message that's not more appropriate in one of the other groups belongs here, from contesting to DX to ragchewing on VHF to information on becoming a ham.

The group rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc is for discussions related to (surprise!) digital amateur radio. This doesn't have to be the common two-meter AX.25 variety of packet radio, either; some of the most knowledgeable folks in radio digital communications can be found here, and anything in the general area is welcome. The name was changed to emphasize this, and to encourage discussion not only of other text-based digital modes, such as AMTOR, RTTY, and Clover, but things like digital voice and video as well. The former group, rec.radio.amateur.packet, has not been removed as of this writing, but it is obsolete, and you should use .digital.misc instead.

The group has the .misc as part of the name to allow further specialization if the users wish it, such as .digital.tcp-ip.

The swap group is now rec.radio.swap. This recognizes a fact that became evident shortly after the original group was formed: Hams don't just swap ham radio gear, and other folks besides hams swap ham equipment. If you have radio equipment, or test gear, or computer stuff that hams would be interested in, here's the place. Equipment wanted postings belong here too. Discussions about the equipment generally don't; if you wish to discuss a particular posting with the buyer, email is a much better way to do it, and the other groups, especially .equipment and .homebrew, are the place for public discussions. There is now a regular posting with information on how to go about buying and selling items in rec.radio.swap; please refer to it before you post there.

The first reorganization added two groups to the list, one of which is rec.radio.amateur.policy. This group was created as a place for all the discussions that seem to drag on interminably about the many rules, regulations, legalities, and policies that surround amateur radio, both existing and proposed. The neverending no-code debate goes here, as does the New Jersey scanner law, the legality of ordering a pizza on the autopatch, what a bunch of rotten no-goodniks the local frequency coordinating body is, and so on.

The other added group is rec.radio.cb. This is the place for all discussion about the Citizens' Band radio service. Such discussions have been very inflammatory in rec.ham-radio in the past; please do not cross-post to both rec.radio.cb and rec.radio.amateur.* unless the topic is genuinely of interest to both hams and CBers - and very few topics are.

The rec.radio.info group is just what its name implies: it's the place where informational messages from across rec.radio.* may be found, regardless of where else they're posted. As of this writing, information posted to the group includes Cary Oler's daily solar propagation bulletins, ARRL bulletins, the Frequently Asked Questions files for the various groups, and radio modification instructions. This group is moderated, so you cannot post to it directly; if you try, even if your message is crossposted to one of the other groups, your message will be mailed to the moderator, who is currently Mark Salyzyn, VE6MGS. The email address for submissions to the group is rec-radio-info@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca. Inquiries and other administrivia should be directed to rec-radio-request@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca. For more information about rec.radio.info, consult the introduction and posting guidelines that are regularly posted to that newsgroup.

The groups rec.radio.amateur.antenna, .equipment, .homebrew, and .space are for more specialized areas of ham radio: discussions about antennas, commercially-made equipment, homebrewing, and amateur radio space operations. The .equipment group is not the place for buying or selling equipment; that's what rec.radio.swap is for. Similarly, the .space group is specifically about

amateur radio in space, such as the OSCAR program and SAREX, the Shuttle Amateur Radio EXperiment; other groups cover other aspects of satellites and space. Homebrewing isn't about making your own alcoholic beverages at home (that's *rec.crafts.brewing*), but rather construction of radio and electronic equipment by the amateur experimenter.

The *rec.radio.amateur.misc*, *.packet*, and *.policy* groups, and the *rec.radio.info* group, are available by Internet electronic mail in digest format; send a mail message containing "help" on a line by itself to *listserv@ucsd.edu* for instructions on how to use the mail server. The *rec.radio.swap* group is not available for reading by electronic mail. At this writing, the most recently added groups are also not available for reading by electronic mail, although that may change.

All of the groups can be posted to by electronic mail, though, by using a gateway at the University of Texas at Austin. To post a message this way, change the name of the group you wish to post to by replacing all of the '.'s with '-'s - for example, *rec.radio.swap* becomes *rec-radio-swap* - and send to that *name@cs.utexas.edu* (*rec-radio-swap@cs.utexas.edu*, for example). You may crosspost by including multiple addresses as Cc: entries (but see below). This gateway's continued availability is at the pleasure of the admins at UT-Austin, and is subject to going away at any time - and especially if forgeries and other net.abuses become a problem. You have been warned.

A Few Words on Crossposting

Please do not crosspost messages to two or more groups unless there is genuine interest in both groups in the topic being discussed, and when you do, please include a header line of the form "Followup-To: group.name" in your article's headers (before the first blank line). This will cause followups to your article to go to the group listed in the Followup-To: line. If you wish to have replies to go to you by email, rather than be posted, use the word "poster" instead of the name of a group. Such a line appears in the headers of this article.

One of the few examples of productive cross-posting is with the *rec.radio.info* newsgroup. To provide a filtered presentation of information articles, while still maintaining visibility in their home newsgroups, the moderator strongly encourages cross-posting. All information articles should be submitted to the *rec.radio.info* moderator so that he may simultaneously cross-post your information to the appropriate newsgroups. Most newsreaders will only present the article once, and network bandwidth is conserved since only one article is propagated. If you make regular informational postings, and have made arrangements with the moderator to post directly to the group, please cross-post as appropriate.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"If my car ran OS/2, it'd be there by now" -- bumper sticker
GCS d++ p+ c++ l+ m+- s/++ g++ w++ t+ r

--
73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU

pschleck@unomaha.edu

Celebrating 60 years of the Univ. of Maryland ARA - W3EAX (1933-1993)

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 93 17:08:12 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:
: In article <CAHtp.5Fu@feenix.metronet.com> marcbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc
Grant) writes:
: >
: >Okay - can you order ham sandwiches?
:
: Which begs the question, can you order from a Kosher deli, or does that
: constitute discrimination based on religious beliefs? And if not, what if
: your ham sandwich comes with a Kosher pickle? :-)
:
Well, the pickle is not being transmitted, and only you and it's installer
knows it is there, so in that case, everyone is safe.

--
Randy, KA1UNW If you get a shock while servicing your equipment
DON'T JUMP! You might break an expensive tube.

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 20:20:54 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-
state.edu!uwm.edu!caen!spool.mu.edu!news.nd.edu!shakespeare!
rnimtz@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1786@arrl.org> bjahnke@arrl.org (Bart Jahnke) writes:
>

>And yes, each answer sheet, code copy sheet, 610, CSCE (previous and current),
>and any other document(s) for each applicant are reviewed. Nearly each
>license copy has to be trimmed and attached to the 610, as the FCC requires.

~~~~~

What size does the license copy have to be trimmed to?

Rick Nimitz  
N9TJG  
nimitz.1@nd.edu

---

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 20:08:11 GMT  
From: olivea!charnel!rat!koko.csustan.edu!nic.csu.net!eis.CalState.EDU!  
jherndo@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

They (the volunteers) shouldn't have to pay for anything.

Well, stop taking it out of "the back pockets" of ARRL members. As quite a few of us have seen, the ARRL is now connected to the Internet. Drop the DIRECT connection, and save several thousand dollars a month.

That's meant more of a poke in the side than anything. But it cues a question, Why is the ARRL online? Why not just hookup to a mail/usenet server. Is there a possible expansion in mind?

---

[> John W. Herndon - INTERNET: jherndo@eis.calstate.edu <]  
~~~~~

Date: 23 Jul 1993 10:36:37 -0700
From: nntp.ucsbs.edu!mustang.mst6.lanl.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!mojo.eng.umd.edu!
news.isi.com!news.isi.com!not-for-mail@network.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com>, <22kbdiINN6ta@bashful.isi.com>, <1993Jul22.174841.184374@locus.com>wland.re
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <1993Jul22.174841.184374@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>Please quote me the words in Part 97 which establish "keeping people out"
>is a goal of the US Amateur Radio Service.

I never said it was a goal. It's simply reality. If things were perfect, we wouldn't need barriers at all, but things are not perfect and, as a consequence, we must accept some kind of filter. Look what happened to CB, where there were no barriers. I doubt any of us would like to see this happen in the amateur service.

>I do not believe you'll find such language.

I never implied the existence of such language.

>The Amateur Radio Service is about *maintaining a pool of trained radio operators of value to the US*.

I find it amusing how many of us hold such an overinflated view of ourselves and our hobby.

>It isn't about maintaining some elitist club with arbitrarily high barriers to jump over.

More like minor speedbumps. If I were an adult attempting to get a ham ticket, I certainly wouldn't complain about the code test because I'd be admitting that I couldn't accomplish something 4-year-olds have done.

>Mind you, I've jumped over all the barriers, too.

Barriers are what you make them out to be. I found them to be insignificant given the privileges conferred even up through the extra class level.

I certainly hope that the "welfare state" mentality advocated here with respect to ham licenses doesn't spill over to society in general. (In many cases it already has, but that's not relevant to this newsgroup.)

--
Jerry Gardner (jerry@isi.com) | "Violence is the last refuge of
Integrated Systems, Inc. | the incompetent" - Isaac Asimov

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 17:48:47 GMT
From: fluke!rem@beaver.cs.washington.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>,
<POPOVICH.93Jul20145616@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>, <22kag8INN6se@bashful.isi.com>a

Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

This appears to be a slant toward hams who have a niche desire in amateur radio, and that's fine. But should the Amateur Radio program be tailored to a specific niche. I think not. Theory covers a lot of ground and even with today's high tech equipment many hams still have to know when something is wrong with the rig, which means taking measurements and yes possibly fixing the problem themselves or knowing when to send it in for repair.

There is also antenna and transmission line theory that many hams still have to deal with. Not to mention electrical and electronic safety around operating electronic equipment.

I think that the No code tech has gone to significant lengths to reduce the amount of technical information one needs to know to get on the air. But even among the No code techs we have, many who wish to go further in the ham field and maybe specialize, are interested in the theory.

I think it would be dangerous not to have someone learn the theory and operate electronic equipment that can be dangerous. Tailoring the tests to specific niche of operation I think would be unwise. What specific theory issues to include or not include would be difficult to decide with some many people with wide varying interests.

Randy AJ7B

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 1993 21:23:12 GMT

From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!paulf@hplabs.hpl.hp.com

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com>, <22kbdiINN6ta@bashful.isi.com>, <1993Jul22.102709.6048@ke4zv.uucp>

Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In <1993Jul22.102709.6048@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Since Morse operation is now a minor part of amateur
>radio, like other specialty operating modes such as ATV, RTTY,
>AMTOR, etc, it's continued testing as a separate element that
>determines your entire pass fail chance for a particular license
>class, is excessive.

A logical statement.

However, once again, you've failed to prove your premise; in particular, failed to demonstrate that CW is used by the average US amateur on HF no

more frequently than ATV, RTTY, AMTOR, or any other "specialty mode". This premise has been made repeatedly, and not rejoindered to demonstrations to the contrary. Repetition does not equate to fact.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, A Nation of Victims

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #256
